



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/787,130

02/27/2004

Naoyuki Ezuka

Q80148

4669

65565 7590 02/06/2008
SUGHRUE-265550
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVE. NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER

XAVIER, VALENTINA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3644

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/06/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/787,130	Applicant(s) EZUKA, NAOYUKI	
	Examiner VALENTINA XAVIER	Art Unit 3644	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 July 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7-13, 15 and 16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7-13, 15 and 16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 – 4, 9, 12, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Yamamoto (US 5,048,223) in view of Wallace (US 3,778,916) and Werner (US 6,620,286).

Yamamoto et al. '223 discloses a fishing rod comprising a rod pipe 11 that is inserted into a reinforced tubular body 12 (**See Fig. at the end of this Office Action**), and a body (material between 12a and 12e – See Fig. at the end of this Office Action) that is integrally molded with an outer side of the tubular body 12, See Fig. 2. Yamamoto et al '233 fails to disclose the body (material between 12a and 12e – See Fig. at the end of this Office Action) being a synthetic resin body, however, Yamamoto et al '223 discloses forming the tubular body 12 out of synthetic resin (col. 4, ll 25). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the body taught by

Yamamoto et al '223 using synthetic resin as used to form the tubular body 12 in order to provided additional strength.

An adhesive agent (bonding agent, Yamamoto '223, col.4, ll.30-33) is formed in recess 12e works as an adhesive for fixing the grip (13).

Regarding claim 4, opening 12a is ready to receive a leg of a reel.

Regarding the transparent characteristic of the synthetic resin body, Yamamoto '223 does not positively disclose whether the construction materials used are colored, opaque, transparent, translucent, etc. Wallace discloses a fishing rod having a handle that he teaches may be made of colored or transparent material for decorative purposes (Wallace, col.1, lns.59-63). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a transparent or translucent material for decorative purposes.

Yamamoto '223 fails to disclose the "concealing film". However, Werner discloses a double-sided tape having a "concealing film" (28). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the adhesive agent of Yamamoto '223 to include the element 28 as taught by Werner in order to provide a carrier for the adhesive to ensure a stronger bond.

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Yamamoto (US 5,048,223) in view of Wallace (US 3,778,916) and Yamamoto et al (US 6,105,302).

Regarding claim 2, Yamamoto '223, as modified, discloses the claimed invention except it is not positively disclosed that the tubular body is formed of a fiber reinforce

prepreg material. Yamamoto '302 teaches the use of such a material, as it is an extremely strong material and will hold up against the forces encountered while sport fishing. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a reinforced prepreg material in order to provide a strong and dependable material, since it has been held that there is no invention in the mere selection of a material that is known in the art for its suitability for the intended purpose. *In re Lesbin*, 125 USPQ 416.

Regarding claim 3, portion 12d of synthetic body 12 is considered to be a cover portion.

Claims 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, and 16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al. (US 6,105,302).

Yamamoto et al. '302 (Yamamoto '302) discloses a fishing rod, as best viewed in Figures 1, 2, and 11, comprising a rod pipe 1, a reinforced tubular body 2 made of a reinforced synthetic resin (col.3, lns.45-50), and a synthetic resin body 42, 43 which is bonded to an outside of the tubular member 2. The synthetic resin body is disclosed as optionally being made of a synthetic resin (col.4, ln.37), or a foamed resin material (col.3, lns.63-64), both of which are softer than the reinforced pre-impregnated resin of the tubular member 2.

Regarding claim 8, the tubular body is inside member 42 of the resin body and is projected or extends in an axial direction of the tubular body.

Regarding claim 10, the tubular body 2 is made from a fiber reinforced plastic.

Regarding claim 11, member 41 is optionally made from a foamed material, artificial cork, or natural cork (col.3, lns.63-64).

Regarding claim 13, a reel mount is meant to fit inside portion 43 of the resin body (Figure 6).

Yamamoto et al '302 fails to disclose the tubular body and the synthetic resin body being integrally molded. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to integrally mold the two bodies, since it has been held that forming in one piece an article which has formerly been formed in two pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art. *Howard v. Detroit Stove Works*, 150 U.S. 164 (1893).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed 07/11/2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-4,7-13,15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a), from page 2, have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made.

In response to applicant's argument that the grip and the synthetic resin body are read as the same element, it is clarified in the above discussion that Examiner considers the outer surface of body 13 to be the grip.

Regarding applicant's argument, on page 3, that the references does not teach the reinforced tubular body extending in an axial direction longer than that of the synthetic

body, there is no reference point to which the extension must begin and in my interpretation of the drawings of '302 the tubular body extends longer than the synthetic body in the directions away from the exposed rod end.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Valentina Xavier whose telephone number is (571) 272-9853. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael R. Mansen can be reached on (571)272-6608. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael R Mansen/

Art Unit: 3644

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3644

VX

